

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 have been allowed.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected.

Claim 3 has been canceled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending in this application.

Formal Matters

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention, as requested by the Examiner. In particular, the term "laser" has been replaced to more properly refer to the antecedent "image source".

Substantive Matters

Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taniguchi et al. (US5162928), hereinafter "Taniguchi". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate one of the elements of allowed claim 18 that the Examiner stated is not taught by Taniguchi. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include a holographic element receiving and magnifying the image to produce a virtual image therefrom.

Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate one of the elements of allowed claim 18 that the Examiner stated is not taught by Taniguchi. Specifically, claim 2 has been amended to include a means for diffusing light that provides adjustable gain for the image thereon.

Claim 8 is dependent on amended claim 1, and the above comments with respect to these independent claims are hereby incorporated by reference.

Inasmuch as the Examiner admits that these amended elements are not taught by Taniguchi, applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been traversed. Accordingly, applicants' amended claims 1 and 2, and dependent claim 8, are deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious from Taniguchi, and are therefore deemed allowable.

Therefore, applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Matsumoto et al. (US5748377), hereinafter "Matsumoto". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claims 9 and 10 are dependent on amended claim 1, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 1, which has been distinguished above. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 4-7, 11, 12, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Stringfellow (US6359737). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 6-7 have been amended to properly follow from amended claim 1. In addition, claims 4 and 6-7 are dependent on amended claim 1, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 1, which has been distinguished above. Therefore, claims 4 and 6-7 are deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to incorporate one of the elements of allowed claim 18 that the Examiner stated is not taught by Taniguchi. Specifically, claim 11 has been amended to include a means for diffusing light that provides adjustable gain for the image thereon. Moreover, Stringfellow also fails to disclose or suggest a diffuser with adjustable gain. Therefore, claim 11 is now deemed allowable.

Claims 12, 15 and 16 are dependent on amended claim 11, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 11, hereby incorporated by reference. Therefore, claims 12, 15 and 16 are deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 13, 14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Stringfellow in further view of Matsumoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13, 14 and 17 are dependent on amended claim 11, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 11, which has been distinguished above. Therefore, claims 13, 14 and 17 are deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.


Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Voloschenko et al.

Customer Number 22917
Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196

By: 
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750